REMARKS

Claims 1-10 have also been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Oldham, U.S. Patent 2,031,786. Also, claims 3-7 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oldham in view of Simonds, U.S. Patent 6,350,114 or Murphy et al., U.S. Patent 6,769,900. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The present invention is directed to a mold for manufacturing pellets of hot-melt ink, wherein the mold creates a mold cavity defined by a first die and a second die, wherein the ink is allowed to cool down and solidify in the mold cavity and subsequently at least one of the first and second dies is provided with heating means for remelting the surface of the ink pellets to facilitate their removal from the mold cavity.

None of the references relied upon by the Examiner, either alone or in combination, even remotely suggest a mold which is specifically designed for the manufacture of pellets of hot melt ink. Characteristic of a mold for the manufacture of pellets of hot melt ink is a fact that at least one of the dies which define the mold cavity have a wall thickness which is smaller than one-half the average diameter of the mold cavity. The thickness of the walls of the first and second dies is important because due to such a small wall thickness, the die has a very low heat capacity whereby the surface layer of the molded pellet can be remelted very quickly by heating the die. The small heat capacity of the die has the further advantage that the molten ink in the mold cavity can be cooled and solidified more rapidly, so that the productivity of the molding process is increased. The Oldham reference does not

recognize the importance of providing first and second dies which define the mold cavity wherein at least one of said dies has a wall thickness which is sufficiently thin to enable and effectuate the removal of the molded pellet from the mold cavity. Of course, the wall thickness of the first and second dies which define the mold cavity is important in the manufacturing of pellets of hot melt ink whereas in the Oldham reference, which is directed to an apparatus for making golf balls, the thinness of the dies defining the mold cavity plays no significant part in the process of the patent, and thus the reference cannot possibly contemplate the importance of controlling the wall thickness of the mold cavity to achieve the Applicant's purpose.

Advantageously, no other holes or openings other than the centrally dispersed runner hold, are present in the mold as this may effect the final shape of the pellet and/or hamper the removal of the pellet from the mold. In this connection, claim 1 has been further amended to recite that the upper die contains a single runner hole. Also the expression "comprising" has been replaced with the expression "consists essentially of" to eliminate the presence of multiple runner holes utilized in the Oldham patent, the presence of which can adversely affect the shape of this pellet or hamper the removal of the pellet.

As the Examiner will note, because the Oldham patent is concerned with making golf balls, the coating is applied to the golf ball utilizing four separate access points, that is, at the top of the mold, at the bottom of the mold, and at the sides of the mold. This is to be distinguished from the mold of the present invention which utilizes only one access hole.

JAK/cm

The Simonds reference, is also concerned with a mold used in the manufacture of golf balls and accordingly, does not recognize the importance of controlling the thickness of the wall of the mold cavity or the position of the runner hole used for the introduction of the ink for the manufacture of ink pellets as defined by the present invention. The Murphy et al. patent is cumulative of the teachings of the Oldham and Simonds references. Clearly, the Examiner, in an effort to reject the claims of the present application, is reconstructing the teachings of the references in view of the Applicants own disclosure.

It is noted, with appreciation, that the Examiner has indicated that claims 2, 8 and 9, although objected to, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, and that claim 11 has been allowed.

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, it is now believed that the present application is in condition for allowance and thus an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Joseph A.

Kolasch (Reg. No. 22,463) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application and the required fee of $120.00 is attached herewith.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: **July 17, 2006**

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Joseph A. Kolasch
Registration No.: 22,463
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

JAK/cm